

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,325	06/02/2005	Michihiro Ohno	HIR-05-1144	3199	
35811 75	90 09/06/2006	EXAMINER			
IP GROUP OF	F DLA PIPER RUDNI(ST	HABTE, KAHSAY			
SUITE 4900		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
PHILADELPHI	IA, PA 19103	1624			
·			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/537,32	5	OHNO ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Kahsay Ha	bte	1624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state ply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF TH R 1.136(a). In no ever riod will apply and will atute, cause the appli	IS COMMUNICATION nt, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this o O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31	1 July 2006.							
,	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
•—									
•	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 17</u> is/are pending in the application.									
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 17</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
αji	a)								
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
			•						
Attachmen	t(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)									
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P						
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	atent Application					

Application/Control Number: 10/537,325 Page 2

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 and 17 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 07/31/2006 in response to the previous Office Action (05/01/2006) is acknowledged. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-11 and 17 has been maintained. The enablement rejection (items 5-6), the second paragraph rejection (item 7) and the claim objection(item 8) has been obviated.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422

Application/Control Number: 10/537,325 Page 3

Art Unit: 1624

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-11 and 17 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 5-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,096. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is significant overlap between the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,096 and the claims of the instant application. The overlap arises when formula (II) in claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,407,096 has the following substituents: $A^3 = alkylene$, alkenylene or alkynylene; $R^1 = X-(CH_2)n-COOR^5$ (equivalent to R^4 in formula (I) of the instant application); $R^3 = hydrogen$, halogen, alkyl or alkoxy; $A^1 = O$; alkyl or alkoxy; alkyl or alkyl (equivalent to alkyl) of the instant application).

Art Unit: 1624

Response to arguments

Applicant's argument filed 07/31/2006 has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,096 ("Ohtake") indicating that the activity of the claimed species show unexpected effect over Ohtake. Applicants enclose a Declaration of Dr. Michiro Ohno that shows data from Human platelet aggregation inhibitory test. The Declaration shows the platelet aggregation inhibitory effect of 31 compounds from the application and compounds of Examples 21 and 32 of '096 patent. It is concluded that the inhibitory effect of the 31 compounds of the application is in the range of 5.1nM – 88nM compared to 1,800nM and >100,000nM of Examples 21 and 32 respectively. The examiner agrees with the test results, but a Declaration can't overcome the double patenting rejection. The examiner's comment in previous Office Action did not suggest that applicants could overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection by submitting a Declaration. The examiner was simply responding to applicant's statement about the inhibitory activity of the 31 compounds. Applicants have to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome this rejection. Note that this rejection is not an obviousness rejection under 103(a).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1624

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte, Ph. D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00AM- 5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 1624

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kahsay Habte Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

KH

September 1, 2006